

I am writing to express my strong opposition to application 20769 and 20770. Copies sent to ANC7D via email & USPS

Page | 1

The proposed houses are not “harmonious” with existing nearby neighborhood houses and not consistent with character of surrounding homes. The proposed dwellings are inconsistent with the neighborhood developed in the area decades ago.

The proposed dwellings are too tall & over-takes the sun light from current 100-year-old homes and homes with roof solar panels. The proposal lacks property parking space considering at least three cars.

Application 20770 is located at corner of Douglas Street. On-property parking need for a least three cars and guest park spaces.

The applicant bought property, spend dollars drawing-up proposed plans knowing well-in advance current variance requirements. The applicant feels 98% sure that Zoning Board will approve request as Zoning Board did ten times in the past.

Applicant believes they can come to selective neighborhoods and Zoning Board will just rubber-stamp their variances requests. A” self-created” by design issue.

The Zoning Board reviewed & approved same applicant requests ten separate times.

The Zoning Board approved each & every one of applicant variance requests! An Agency approval pattern that only benefits the applicate.

All requests were within the last few years. Clearly not equal protection of community laws.

In the past, homes on Douglas St NE DC existed in exact same location without any variances and without 2-3 sides between Douglas St properties.

To conduct any routine maintenance to either side of homes becomes problematic next to impossible working within a 2-3ft space. Try using a ladder in such a confine space of 2-3 foot.

To approve variance would make both sides of property useless with adverse impacts to existing property values! The applicant is the only one gaining directly from existing property owners.

Page | 2

The applicant does not meet test of “practical difficulty and unnecessary hardship.” The Applicant’s property is not unique in any way. A” self-created” by design issue.

The Zoning Board should be equitable and helping and protecting communities.

The Lily Ponds Neighborhood want applicant propose dwellings that are the same size in height and character and “harmonious” with existing nearby neighborhood houses

Lily Ponds Neighborhood pleads inconvenience, financial burdens, property value declines, and lack of awareness of the requirements as the basis for a variance.



both sides of property useless with adverse impacts to existing property values!

CONCLUSION POINTS

- *To conduct any routine maintenance to either side of homes becomes problematic next to impossible working within a 2-3ft space. Try using a ladder in such a confine space of 2-3 foot.*

To approve variance would make both sides of property useless with adverse impacts to existing property values! The applicant is the only one benefiting directly at existing property owner's expense.

- Variance to build proposed two-story and basement structure would limit the light and air to adjacent properties or to other dwellings in the neighborhood. Parking spaces within property for three park cars. *Approving variance would obstruct existing neighbors full use of property.*
- Lily Ponds Neighborhoods want strict adherence to the "unique hardship" test and any other zoning ordinance criteria for granting these variances or special exceptions.
- Variances for the lot area, side yard and the lot width will have a great negative impact to existing houses. Douglas Street homes would lose full use of land that is currently in use. The Douglas Street home properties pay full property tax for existing use.

Best regards,

Frank Matthews & Douglas Street homeowners